

hope to achieve objectives of long-range value to the Nation unless there is Government interest and support.

That applies to fair foreign trade or unemployment.

There is an erroneous impression that we, and other unions, favor Government intervention into and consequent control over our affairs.

This is absolutely absurd.

We recognize that Government has the right to act at any time in what it deems to be the public interest. But we prefer in labor-management relations to work out our own problems, wherever possible, through the processes of free collective bargaining.

I do believe that the chances of solving our common national problems are considerably enhanced when labor, management, and Government all are sighted in on the same target.

There are a few other illusions I would like to correct before I close.

The first of these is the idea that our union blindly insists on imposing some so-called pattern of wage and social benefits upon all and sundry plants with which we hold contracts.

It is true that we seek the best for all of our people, but it is most untrue that we seek the impossible. Our union always is mindful of, and seeks to make reasonable accommodations to special problems, where these problems are proven to exist.

Nor do we attempt to exercise a voice in the pricing policies, or the profits of the companies with which we have contract relations. We do not want any part of these, or any other rights of management.

We do want our plants and factories to be profitable. We are very well aware that in our democratic capitalistic system, profitable operation is necessary to keep people at work.

There may be one final illusion limited largely to this audience.

And that concerns the idea that I may have something to say about what the United Auto Workers will seek, or perhaps achieve, in the forthcoming negotiations.

The answer is that I do not have anything to say and I will not.

That is a problem which concerns the Auto Workers and the industry.

I hope that it can be resolved amicably and fairly.

Finally, I do not expect to find all acceptance of my ideas in this forum but I do hope that these expressions will generate ideas of your own on the need for solving the common problems.

The time has come for all of us to consider ideas for what they are worth, rather than where they originated.

We must consider that we are in another industrial revolution with the prospect of a social upheaval which may change the world for centuries to come.

In previous eras of great industrial change there always were new lands to settle and cultivate. Today our new frontiers must be established with our brains, rather than with the plow and rifle.

That will take massive intellectual effort.

It is time we all put our minds to the task.

Modernization of Federal Salary Systems

SPEECH
OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain

officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate I wish to make two points; then I will yield to the majority whip, who will consume about half of the time remaining.

I hope that on tomorrow we will not hear any more of this facetious, preposterous, non sequitur argument that "there are many candidates back home in my district who want to run for Congress" and therefore we should not raise salaries. This has been said a half dozen times today, and I hope we will not hear it tomorrow.

Are those people who make this argument saying that the office of a Member of Congress ought to go to the lowest bidder—that we should reduce the salary to \$20,000, to \$15,000, to \$12,000, to \$5,000, and so long as there is one man who says, "I will run for Congress," we will lower it some more?

Then you might have a social occasion and you say, "Ladies and gentlemen, I want to present your Congressman, the only man we could find in nine counties who would go to Washington for this salary we are offering." Logically, if this argument has only validity, that is what we are saying. I think you could get people to run for Congress, if you would, who would pay the U.S. Government \$22,500, and those who want real economy here and to improve the Federal fiscal position maybe believe that is something we ought to do, but I will tell you the kind of people we would get, if that is what you are talking about. You would get the kind of people that we do not want in Congress. So I hope, gentlemen, that we will not hear any more of this argument tomorrow.

I said this was a management bill. We have heard talk about the deficit and we do have a deficit, and I am going to do all I can to balance the budget around here.

But let me tell you why this argument is not particularly valid. Let me cite you a case history: In the Defense Department is a man whose responsibilities include, among others, the detailed examination of all aspects of a major weapons system and he must isolate decisions which will be required in the next 5 budget years and be ready with prudent alternatives. These decisions involve hundreds of millions of dollars. This man is a GS-18, at \$20,000 a year. He came here from a top executive position with an aircraft maker where he received about \$40,000 a year. Every month or so people from industry come in and say to him, "We want you as vice president at \$40,000 a year."

So far he has been dedicated. However, when the day comes for him to go, if we take away the hope that we are going to give him a decent salary, you can send all the Members you want down there to say to him, "Let us tell you about our deficit and let us tell you about the national debt and let us tell you about what great trouble the Government has." This fellow, if he has a family and is going to send his children to college, if he can get a better job, unless he is dedicated, is going to say, "I do not care.

You go and tell that story about that Federal debt and that deficit and all of the rest of the troubles the Government has to someone else."

I have case histories and I have a dozen of them of people who have been presidents of corporations and who are sought after every month by private corporations to leave their jobs at double and triple their salaries. They hang on because they want to serve the Government. Yet we have had more and more turnover in these critical positions and we lose these men at just about the time they begin to produce for the Government. These positions I might add carry very little honor or prestige.

As the National Association of Manufacturers said:

If a business were losing money because costs were too high, it might consider hiring some new department heads to cut costs—pay them well for doing it and thus balance the budget.

But not Government.

This is a bill that will do something for the taxpayers and help us to get the kind of Federal Establishment we can all be a little more proud of. I hope the Committee of the Whole tomorrow will support our committee in the particular amendments that are going to be offered and, rollcall or no rollcall, that we will pass this bill, because it is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time remains to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], the majority whip.

Resolution Opposing Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a resolution which has been approved by Ward 3 of the South Carolina Democratic Party in Laurens, S.C., in support of the position being taken by those of us who oppose the so-called civil rights legislation. This resolution has been approved by the Laurens County Democratic Convention and is being forwarded to the South Carolina State Democratic Party Convention which will be held on March 25, 1964.

I appreciate, Mr. President—and I know I speak for all of us in opposition to this power grab legislation—the strong words of encouragement and support which this resolution lends to our cause.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LAURENS, S.C., February 22, 1964.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SOUTHERN SENATORS IN STAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Whereas it is the prerogative and duty of citizens interested in the common good and welfare of the people to communicate to

their representatives in the Congress their feelings and opinions on far-reaching and momentous proposals, and

Whereas in these troublous times, it is apparent that the workshops of the sociologists and the rampagings of extremists are dictating to our courts and being joined by them in trying to change the very way of life of all men overnight, and

Whereas it is obvious that the so-called civil rights bill soon to be debated by the Senate of the United States is the result of high-pressure motivated by a purpose conceived in vengeance and turmoil, nurtured in a vicious climate of exploitation and promoted by ruthless political maneuvers for personal and group advantages that would strip the people of personal, social, civic, civil, and business freedom and liberties and set-up a Gestapo-type of organization of marauders that would run roughshod over the minds and hearts of men and reduce to shambles the very foundation upon which this great Nation was founded and built: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That this Democratic Party convention here assembled in Laurens County voice its condemnation of the so-called civil rights bill; further be it

Resolved, That a communication be sent to each of our United States Senators telling them of our support of their stand against the vicious bill.

To be sent to State Democratic convention.

Vietnam Need: Winning the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, for years now some of us have been saying that the only way to win the war in Vietnam was for the Central Government to win the loyalty and allegiance of the people. An article by Takashi Oka in the March 9 issue of the Christian Science Monitor points this out very well, and I include it herewith:

VIETNAM NEED: WINNING THE PEOPLE
(By Takashi Oka)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—To gain victory in South Vietnam's frustrating war against the Communist guerrillas, there must be a shift in emphasis from killing Communists to winning the people.

This is a view widely shared by Vietnamese and Americans with long experience in combating the Vietcong, the Communist guerrillas.

Trite and worn as the phrase "winning the people" may sound, and as many times as lipservice has been paid to this slogan, it is still the irreducible minimum for winning victory, these observers say.

"For 3 years the Pentagon has emphasized military measures—killing the Vietcong," one knowledgeable source commented.

"We've killed thousands of Vietcong, according to our statistics, yet those 45 Vietcong battalions still remain.

"What we have got to do is to get the villagers to defend themselves—motivate them to defend themselves. This will take care of the small unit actions that form the bulk of Vietcong attacks today. Then the regular army can concentrate on the large action—the 300- or 400-men attacks—which villagers obviously can't come with."

The problem is how to motivate the vil-

lagers. Some months ago a survey was conducted to determine what a villager actually wanted. The list boiled down to four essentials: first, physical security; second, economic opportunity; third, local self-determination; fourth, the rule of law.

It was obvious that the Communists could not provide any of these four requisites except in a limited degree over limited periods of time. It was clear that the Government of South Vietnam as then constituted also failed to perform this task.

But the government was and is in a far better position to do this than the Communists. And when and as it does, it has a legitimate claim on the loyalty of the villagers.

In another, more recent survey, 33,000 people in a single critical province near Saigon were interviewed. Many grievances against the government came to light.

But the surveyors found that the interviewees also had an active antipathy toward the Communist guerrillas in their midst. In some villages, interviewees supplied rosters of resident Communists at considerable risk to themselves.

Potentially, therefore, the villagers were not "attentists"—fence sitters. They had definite ideas as to how they wanted the government to function. And to the extent that the government actually did function in this manner it could begin to regain ground lost during the final years of the dictatorial Ngo Dinh Diem regime.

As for the argument that the war should be carried to the north, thoughtful observers here say that it sounds like a panacea which does nothing to solve the primary problem—winning the allegiance of the people in the South Vietnamese countryside.

The war must be fought and won in the south, whatever may happen in the north, these observers say. And in their view this war is in the highest sense a political war. Military means are useful only as this basic fact is recognized and applied.

Panama and the Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday I had the pleasure of meeting with my good friends of Centreville, Md. This meeting, which was so ably arranged and led by Mrs. David Williamson, evidenced the interest and concern of fellow Marylanders about this country's foreign and domestic policies. While there, an article published in the Queen Anne's Record-Observer was called to my attention. The article, written by Capt. Phillip W. Reeves, discusses the timely topic of Panama. The captain, who is a master mariner, has seen the canal many times while sailing from New York to California. Therefore, he speaks from a personal knowledge of the situation and his feelings merit examination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In view of the discussions now going on about the Panama Canal, it might be of interest to review, briefly, the canal history.

In 1534 King Charles V of Spain ordered a survey made for a proposed canal across the isthmus.

In 1855 the Panama Railroad across the isthmus from Colon on the Atlantic side to Panama City on the Pacific side, was completed. It is said that a man died for each cross-tie in the railroad track. At that time yellow fever was the curse of the tropics. Until the canal was completed passengers and freight were transshipped across the isthmus on this railroad.

Actual construction of the canal was started by the French in January 1880. The French Canal Co. had a concession granted by the Government of Colombia in 1878.

The Panama Railroad, the canal rights and properties of the French Canal Co. were bought by the United States for \$40 million in 1904.

The Isthmus of Panama is the principal and most important part of the Republic of Panama. It was originally a part of the Republic of Colombia. Panama was established as an independent Republic at the time when the United States was negotiating for the purchase of the canal properties from the French. The new Republic was made possible by the backing of the United States.

The newly created Republic of Panama granted by treaty, to the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, a right-of-way across the isthmus 10 miles wide and 50 miles long. The Panama Railroad is in this zone. The United States paid the Republic of Panama \$10 million and agreed to pay each year, starting 9 years after the treaty was ratified, the sum of \$250,000 gold. Since then this sum has been increased until today it is about \$2 million.

The treaty with the Republic of Panama was ratified February 28, 1904, and work started on the canal by the U.S. Army Engineers under General Goethals. Panama and the Canal Zone were cleaned up and the yellow fever brought under control. Today sanitary regulations are very strict and the Canal Zone is one of the healthiest places in the world.

When the U.S. Engineers took over the construction of the canal they found that a sea level canal was not practical on account of the difference in the height of the tides on the Atlantic and Pacific sides of the canal. On the Pacific side the tides are 28 feet on the Atlantic side, 4 feet. This is why a sea level canal cannot be built across the isthmus here or in any other location.

Thousands of contract laborers, mostly West Indian Negroes, were brought in to work on the canal. A tough crowd who were kept in order by the Canal Zone police.

The population of the Republic of Panama is a mixture of races. Spanish the official language. Population in 1955 was 911,400.

Panama exports some bananas, coffee, and tropical products. Her main source of income of course, is the canal payments and what business is brought there by the ships using the canal. Most of the local merchants are Chinese or East Indians.

The University of Panama is a small college in the city of Panama. It is doubtful if it would be an accredited college by our standards. The teaching staff like so many others is dominated by Communists who are the plotters and instigators of most of the canal troubles. The student riots that we hear so much about are standard Communist procedure in all Latin American colleges.

The Communist professors and politicians believe that they can steal the canal from the United States by following the example set by Sucz. That the politicians in Washington will submit peacefully to their takeover of the canal. All kinds of arguments will be offered in the United Nations to justify their claim. No doubt the Panamanians are taking into consideration the failure of the United States of America to do more than talk about the so-called nationaliza-